

CLARIFICATION

In 2024, we were made aware that a technical report on our web server was publicly accessible via search engines. This technical report contains statements and observations which may be misleading. As a consequence, we have withdrawn this report from our web server. We had already ordered that this report no longer be used in 2021. We still stand by this decision today. Furthermore, we would like to provide further clarification on this technical report as detailed below.

Statements of the report that require further clarification:

1. “Innovox FG does contain 100 % pure calcium oxide and therefore more effective than some competitors products which contain 80 % calcium oxide only.” **This statement may be misleading.**

Clarification:

This statement should be read:

Innovox FG contains 100 % quick lime compared to some competitors’ products, which has a content of 80 % pure, reactive calcium oxide.

2. “Innovox MG contains 80 % pure calcium oxide and is therefore comparable to some competitors products, which also contain 80 % calcium oxide.” **This statement may be misleading.**

Clarification:

This statement should be read:

The product Innovox MG contains 80 % quick lime. However, some competitors’ products contain 80 % pure, reactive calcium oxide.

3. “The dispersion test which was published in the technical report introducing Innovox MG has been performed by the company ARTIS and is claiming, that the dispersion of Innovox MG inside the described EPDM rubber compound is better than the dispersion of some competitors products.” **This statement may be misleading, in particular without addition information about the test, and how this test has been carried out.**

Clarification:

Artis, an Independent Rubber Consultant, carried out a series of tests following ASTM D3568 – 03(2018) standard tests for EPDM compounds.

We stated that the dispersion test, performed according to an inhouse test method of Artis, showed that Innovox MG performed better than some competitors’ products; however, this test was based on a single sample only using a scanning electron microscope.

For these reasons, we have already withdrawn the above-described test report from our web server and are not using them in any other way, neither directly nor indirectly.

We apologize for any confusion.